Punta Venado, with relatives of each man joining the fray. After order had been restored, the chief stated that the land belonged to Romulo and that Huru was too young to have known what had happened earlier. Huru wanted Romulo to pay twenty sucres damages for cutting his head in the brawl, but Romulo refused on the grounds that Huru had started the argument. He did however, buy a half bottle of rum, which they consumed together. Both Huru and Romulo are "family," but the manner of relationship is unknown.

423
[627]
[691]
[683]

Boundaries of land become well known with usage and may be disputed when the land is not used intensively. In either case, disputes may occur but are more apt to require settlement by a third party, if the boundaries are not well known.

423
685
691

A Negro official renders a Cayapa-type decision. After Sanchi built a house on his land, he observed one day that Perdomo had planted bananas nearby. Sanchi insisted that they had been planted on his land and, with his mother's brother, Heverico, called in Cristobal, the Negro Inspectór of the village of Camerones at that time. Cristobal decided that Perdomo should keep

423
685
177

and probed and usually found wanting. ooo

Cayapa law readily lends itself to a division into Civil and Criminal law. The former is concerned mainly with property (especially land) while the latter is preeminently concerned with sexual behavior and sin. In the realm of Cayapa Civil law, especially in cases that involve land, legal decisions are compromises in the sense that the usurper is permitted limited return on his labor. There is agreement by all parties to the dispute that land as such is owned, but lacking written records, the best proof that a claimant to land ownership has is evidence of his having worked the land he claims. Work is the best validation of ownership, but the land need not be continuously worked; however, as work is neglected, and as memories fade, ownership is contested. Basically, land disputes involve a claim by the usurper that the original ownership is in jeopardy. These claims are always balanced with the claims of the owner and a compromise solution is reached. The land, in effect, is shared for a period of time and the owner is warned that he must continue to work his land intensively or be subject to further challenges to his ownership. Compromise is an effective

671
691
423
[684]
[695]
[622]

671
691
423
622

solution and serves to exclude the chief from entangling alliances with one party as opposed to the other. Whether this serves to enhance the position of the chief in his role as third person in the legal process, is not clear. Aubert (1963) believes that mediating decisions foster independence for the third party office, as well as increased prestige. Structurally, the office of /ún^{y}i/ is an independent one that does not permit the formation of alliances with groups that are virtually impossible to form anyway, given the social and psychological structure of Cayapa culture.

671
[691]
[423]

In the legal materials dealing with land it is seen that all of the parties to the dispute were in complete agreement as to the nature of land and its ownership. Conflict does not involve different value positions on the part of the disputants but rather individuals are competing for scarce goods that embody shared cultural values. Polygyny among the Cayapa represents a mixture of competing interests, as in land disputes, and also some lack of agreement as to what the basic issues and values are. Women are valued goods, in a sense, that at present are in scant supply. A compromise solution, as in land disputes, is not

[684]
[595]
[178]

[695]